

Adopted: July 16, 2013

CONNECTICUT STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes – Special Meeting
Wednesday, May 1, 2013

A special meeting of the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee “Advisory Committee” was held on Wednesday, May 1, 2013, at the offices of Connecticut Innovations, 865 Brook Street, Rocky Hill, Connecticut.

Call to Order: Noting the presence of a quorum, Marianne Horn, representing Jewel Mullen, Chairperson of the Advisory Committee and Commissioner of the Department of Public Health, called the meeting to order at 1:08 p.m. Members present: Treena Livingston Arinzeh, Ph.D. (by phone); Richard H. Dees, Ph.D. (by phone); Sandra Engle, Ph.D. (by phone); Gerald Fishbone, M.D (by phone); Myron Genel, M.D. (by phone); David Goldhamer, Ph.D. (by phone); Ronald Hart, Ph.D. (by phone); Marianne Horn, J.D., representing Jewel Mullen, M.D., M.P.H., M.P.A. (by phone); James Hughes, Ph.D. (by phone); Diane Krause, M.D., Ph.D. (by phone); Paul Pescatello, J.D., Ph.D. (by phone); and Milton B. Wallack, D.D.S. (by phone).

Member absent: Ann Kiessling, Ph.D.

Other Attendees: Cheryl Alleva (CI); Terri Clark (CASE); Claire Leonardi (CI); and Rick Strauss (CASE).

Opening Remarks:

Attorney Horn thanked the Advisory Committee members on behalf of Commissioner Mullen for their continued assistance and support with the Stem Cell Research Program. She reminded the Advisory Committee members that completed Statement of Ethics forms are due today, May 1, 2013.

Overview of Scoring Analysis:

Attorney Horn and Mr. Strauss explained that the purpose of the special meeting is to review the analysis of the Peer Review scores before the grant review committee meeting to help determine a reasonable process for assigning the Advisory Committee review of the proposals.

Mr. Strauss provided an overview of the Study Section meetings held on April 25 at the University of Vermont, noting that some of the scores were changed as a result of discussions held at the Study Section. He discussed the scores that were changed through the Study Section process for each of the categories.

Adopted: July 16, 2013

Mr. Strauss explained that a number of proposals required reconciliation following the Peer Reviews because of scoring differentials greater than one point. He provided an overview of the percentage of proposals in each category that scored equal to or better than 30. Mr. Strauss explained how the proposals were put into bands of merit similar to the National Institutes of Health bands. He talked about the breakdown of scoring in each of the ranges in the bands.

Discussion of Core Proposal Scores:

The Advisory Committee members discussed the Peer Review scores for the two core grants, and there was general consensus to review both proposals.

MOTION: Upon a motion made by Dr. Genel, seconded by Dr. Fishbone, the Advisory Committee members voted unanimously in favor of reviewing the 2 core proposals submitted for 2013 grant funding. VOTE: 12-0-0 (In favor: Arinzeh, Dees, Engle, Fishbone, Genel, Goldhamer, Hart, Horn, Hughes, Krause, Pescatello and Wallack). **MOTION PASSED.**

Discussion of Group Proposal Scores:

The Advisory Committee members discussed the score for the one Group grant proposal submitted for 2013 funding.

MOTION: Upon a motion made by Dr. Fishbone, seconded by Dr. Goldhamer, the Advisory Committee members voted unanimously in favor of reviewing the Group proposal submitted for 2013 grant funding. VOTE: 12-0-0 (In favor: Arinzeh, Dees, Engle, Fishbone, Genel, Goldhamer, Hart, Horn, Hughes, Krause, Pescatello and Wallack). **MOTION PASSED.**

Discussion of Disease Directed Group Proposal Scores:

Mr. Strauss mentioned that at the Study Section, the score for 1 Disease-Directed Group proposal was changed. The Advisory Committee members discussed the scores for the proposals. Some concern was expressed with excluding any of the Disease-Directed Group proposals without knowing the details of the proposals and the rationale for the change of score at the Study Section. There was some discussion about the number of Disease-Directed Group proposals that could be funded with the limited amount of funding available. A suggestion was made to review the 3 best scored proposals but to allow Advisory Committee members to nominate proposals to be reviewed that may have weaker scores than those being reviewed. Attorney Horn cautioned against bringing up proposals after a process for reviewing has been established. After further discussion, there was general

Adopted: July 16, 2013

consensus to review the best scored 5 Disease-Directed Group proposals since the scoring is close.

Ms. Leonardi noted the potential for changes because of the lack of general capacity to handle further increases in the program.

MOTION: Upon a motion made by Dr. Wallack, seconded by Dr. Fishbone, the Advisory Committee members voted in favor of reviewing the top 5 Disease-Directed Group proposals. 10-2-0 (In favor: Arinzeh, Dees, Engle, Fishbone, Genel, Hart, Horn, Krause, Pescatello and Wallack; Opposed: Goldhamer and Hughes)
MOTION PASSED.

Discussion of Established Investigator Proposal Scores:

Mr. Strauss reviewed the scores after the Study Section for the Established Investigator proposals, noting that three proposals were rescored from 25 to 30. Following a discussion of the scores, there was general consensus to review the 17 proposals that scored 30 or better.

MOTION: Upon a motion made by Dr. Wallack, seconded by Dr. Fishbone, the Advisory Committee members voted unanimously in favor of reviewing the 17 Established Investigator proposals that scored 30 or better. VOTE: 12-0-0 (In favor: Arinzeh, Dees, Engle, Fishbone, Genel, Goldhamer, Hart, Horn, Hughes, Krause, Pescatello and Wallack). **MOTION PASSED.**

Discussion of Seed Proposal Scores:

Mr. Strauss mentioned that following the Study Section, 45 out of 61 Seed proposals scored less than 40. The Advisory Committee members discussed the differences in scores and the need to have a cutoff score for review. A suggestion was made to review the 38 Seed proposals that received a score of 30 or better. After further discussion, there was general consensus to review the 28 Seed proposals that received scores below 30.

Adopted: July 16, 2013

MOTION: Upon a motion made by Dr. Genel, seconded by Dr. Wallack, the Advisory Committee members voted unanimously in favor of reviewing the 28 Seed proposals that scored below 30 by the Peer Reviewers. VOTE: 12-0-0 (In favor: Arinzeh, Dees, Engle, Fishbone, Genel, Goldhamer, Hart, Horn, Hughes, Krause, Pescatello and Wallack). **MOTION PASSED.**

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Mr. Strauss urged the Advisory Committee members to make sure they can access the information and links provided by CASE as soon as the information is made available so that technical issues can be resolved quickly.

Next Meeting Date

Attorney Horn mentioned that the Grant Review meeting will be held on Monday, June 10, 2013, at the Rocky Hill Sheraton beginning at 8:15 a.m.

Adjournment

MOTION: Upon a motion made by Dr. Krause, seconded by Dr. Wallack, the Advisory Committee members voted unanimously in favor of adjourning the meeting at 2:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Dr. Jewel Mullen, Chair